Confidential – Not for Distribution DALLAS COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS COURT

04 JUL 28 PM 4: 03

July 28, 2004

TO: The Honorable Commissioners Court

FROM: Selection Committee for RFP #2004-064-1485

SUBJECT: Susceptible Vendor Recommendation for RFP #2004-064-1485
               Recording, Indexing and Imaging System

Background:
The Dallas County selection committee attended vendor demonstrations from June 14-June 23, 2004 for the following vendors: ACS, AmCad, BearingPoint, and LanData.

On June 24, 2004 the selection committee met to discuss results of vendor demonstrations and determined that, prior to the completing and reassessment of vendor susceptibility, additional financial statement information was required from all vendors.

The selection committee has received and reviewed the additional financial statement information provided by the vendors and met on July 15th to discuss the findings from the financial statement review and re-assess vendor susceptibility.

Results and Recommendations:
As a result of the July 15th meeting, the selection committee voted unanimously to render AmCad and LanData *susceptible* to advance to Stage 3 of the RFP process. The remaining vendors, ACS and BearingPoint, were rendered *non-susceptible* to advance in the RFP process by a nearly unanimous 9:1 majority vote of the Selection Committee. These votes represent a strong disparity in abilities between those companies found to be susceptible and those found to be non-susceptible. The two vendors found to be non-susceptible were also the lowest ranked in the functional and technical areas evaluated.

It is therefore recommended that the Dallas County Commissioners Court accept the recommendation of the selection committee as outlined in a briefing dated July 27, 2004.

The following attachments provide background information that supports the selection committee's recommendation:

- Attachment A: Summary of Rationale
- Attachment B: Cost Analysis
- Attachment C: Scoring Summary from RFP Analysis
- Attachment D: Vendor Demonstration Script

Attachments

Note: Observations and analysis presented in this document are based on information provided to the County through the vendors' RFP responses and software demonstrations

CONFIDENTIAL– Not for distribution.   Page 1 of 7

46

GE-1804-0046

Proposed Non-Susceptible Vendors

BearingPoint

- According to the vendor's RFP response, the system represents a 91% fit with County's stated functional and technical requirements. Following the vendor's full day software demonstration, the selection committee concurred that while the software was very good; the overall fit of the system fell below the 91% originally reported fit and was unsatisfactory.
- Prime contractor has no experience with County Clerk Recorder functions
- The software subcontractor's financial statements revealed trends that raised concerns regarding the ability to perform through the duration of the contract
- Highest cost hardware, software and implementation services proposal including costly marketing proposal (see Attachment B)
- Reference check issues
- Concerns regarding the coordination of six companies to provide the services proposed
- Unproven business model
- Inability to justify financial proposals and models

Result: 5:1 vote that BearingPoint be rendered *non-susceptible* to continue in RFP process.

ACS

- While the vendor's written response to the functional and technical requirements in the RFP yielded a 91% fit, the system did not meet the selection committee's expectations based on those responses and the committee rated the actual fit significantly lower than that reported by the vendor in their RFP response. Following the vendor's full day software demonstration, there was unanimous consensus of the selection committee that the software was the least functional and least user-friendly of all of the systems evaluated.
- Software demonstration was unsuccessful in demonstrating the benefits to Dallas County. In addition, the system crashed a minimum of three times during the software demonstration which did not occur during any of the other software demonstrations.
- Proposed system reflects stale application technology and processes and a more labor-intensive system
- During the software demonstration, the vendor was not receptive to suggestions from the selection committee for software changes or modifications to the proposed process flow of documents
- Turnover in the "Technical Project Leader" position, the key position on this project, rendering uncertainty with necessary technology
- Cumbersome adjustment/accounting/audit processes
- Incomplete audit trail capabilities
- Reference check issues
- A minimum of 25% of the proposed solution was unclear with regard to the experience level and roles of personnel
- Restricted data extraction functionality, hampering use of public data

Result: 5:1 vote that ACS be rendered *non-susceptible* to continue in RFP process.

Note. Observations and analysis presented in this document are based on information provided to the County through the vendors' RFP responses and software demonstrations.

Attachment B: Cost Analysis

	Landata	AmCAD	ACS	Bearing Point
Hardware				
Purchase Price	$ 528,209	$ 470,553	$ 750,000	$ 589,052
First Year Maintenance	21,128	38,344	25,000	55,336
Total	$ 549,337	$ 508,897	$ 775,000	$ 644,388
Software				
Purchase Price	$ 217,500	$ 443,600	$ 675,000	$ 565,543
First Year Maintenance	39,150	111,300	195,000	134,275
Total	$ 256,650	$ 554,900	$ 870,000	$ 699,918
Implementation				
Service Costs	$ 77,800	$ 965,410	$ 150,000	$ 745,500
Travel	25,200	25,000	.	39,797
Total	$ 103,000	$ 990,410	$ 150,000	$ 785,297
Required Options				
Custom Programming	$ -	$ -	$	
Oce Large Doc Scanner Printer		$ 49,500		
Total	$ -	$ 49,500	$	$ -
First Year Total	$ 908,987	$ 2,103,707	$ 1,795,000	$ 2,129,103
Annual Maintenance				
Hardware	$ 21,128	$ 42,799	$ 26,314	$ 55,336
Software	39,150	111,300	220,625	149,568
Total	$ 60,278	$ 154,099	$ 246,939	$ 205,304
Ongoing Annual Cost	$ 60,278	$ 154,099	$ 246,939	$ 205,304
On-site Support (5 years)	$ 450,000			
Total 5-Year Cost	$ 1,600,101	$ 2,720,103	$ 2,782,758	$ 2,950,820
Cost Ranking	1	2	3	4

48

GE-1804-0048

Attachment C: Scoring Summary from RFP Analysis

Summary of Selection Committee Scoring
Resulting from Phase 1 Evaluation of RFP

Vendors		County Clerk		Chief Deputy		Budget		Audit		Purchasing		IT		Total Points	Overall Rank
		Points	Rank	Points	Rank	Points	Rank	Points	Rank	Points	Rank	Points	Rank		
Proposed Susceptible Vendors	LanData	76.3	1	71.2	1	76.0	1	57.3	1	69.7	1	80.0	1	430.6	1
	AmCad	68.8	2	62.3	2	70.5	2	50.4	3	61.0	4	78.0	2	391.0	2
Proposed Non-Susceptible Vendors	Bearing Point	67.3	3	59.6	7	66.2	3	49.7	4	63.9	3	71.0	3	377.6	3
	ACS	57.2	6	59.9	6	65.1	4	52.1	2	65.7	2	71.0	3	371.1	4

Fit Analysis Ranking (as reported by each vendor in their RFP response)

Fit Analysis Ranking			
Vendors	Fit %	Rank	
AmCad	94%	1	
LanData	93%	2	
Bearing Point	91%	3	* Tie ranking
ACS	91%	3	* Tie ranking

Note: Observations and analysis presented in this document are based on information provided to the County through the vendors' RFP responses and software demonstrations

CONFIDENTIAL – Not for distribution   *Page 4 of 7*

GE-1804-0049

49

Attachment D: Vendor Demonstration Script

Item	Description	Time
1.	Vendor Setup	7:00 – 8:15
2.	Opening Remarks – County	8:30 – 8:45
3.	Company Overview • Background • Experience in Recorder Solutions • Statutory Compliance	8:45 – 9:00
4.	Official Public Records - Traditional • Description of Workflow • Perform Steps 1-15 (refer to separate handout containing Official Public Records Demonstration Scripts) • Demonstrate escrow account management including adding to balance, paying with escrow funds, and creating invoices • Discuss Indexing Outsource Plan • Demonstrate Cashier Close Out Process • Discuss Mail Back Process	9:00 – 10:10
5.	Official Public Records - eRecording • Description of Workflow - including how outside companies will submit. • Simulate Level 1 • Simulate Level 2 • Simulate Level 3	10:10 – 10:30
6.	Break	10:30 – 10:40
7.	Marriage • Description of Workflow • Issue Traditional Application • Issue Application for Minor • Issue Application for Absent Applicant • Issue Declaration of Informal Marriage • File Marriage License • Issue Certified Copy • Produce Single Status	10:40 – 11:00
8.	Birth • Description of Workflow • Record Birth Certificate • Issue Certified Copy • Process Amendment or Expunge record and Lock Record	11:00 – 11:20
9.	Death • Description of Workflow • Record Death Certificate • Issue Certified Copy • Process Amendment or Expunge record and Lock Record	11:20 – 11:40
10.	Other Records • Assumed Names • DD214 • Personal Property	11:40 – 11:55

Note: *Observations and analysis presented in this document are based on information provided to the County through the vendors' RFP responses and software demonstrations.*

11.	Lunch (Supplied by County)	11:55 – 12:40
12.	Public Research - Traditional • Description of Workflow • Demo Public Search • Demo Staff Procedures to Process Requests	12:40 – 1:00
13.	Public Research - Web • Description of Workflow • Demo Web Search • Demo Staff Procedures to Process Requests	1:00 – 1:20

14.	Miscellaneous
	• On-line Help
	• Data Extraction for Public Requests
	• Workflow Tracking Tools
	• Reports
	   – Production Reports (Bring Samples)
	   – End of Day Reports (Bring Samples)
	   – End of Month Reports (Bring Samples)
	   – End of Year Reports (Bring Samples)
	   – Ad Hoc Reporting
	• Application Security
	   – System Administration
	   – Password Control
	   – Establishing User Security Profiles
	   – Fee Maintenance
	   – Viewing Audit Trails and Transaction Logs
	• Backfile Procedures/Capabilities
	• Discuss Process to Create Microfilm
	• Processing/Tracking Bad Checks
		1:20 – 1:50

15.	Implementation Approach/Timeline • Data Conversion Services • Change Management • Project Management • Training • Customization • Testing • Implementation • Maintenance and Support	1:50 – 2:30
16.	Break	2:30 – 2:45
17.	Technical Review	2:45 – 3:15
18.	Question and Answer related to the RFP and Demo	3:15 – 4:00
19.	Open to Public for Public Access Demo	4:00 – 5:00
20.	Breakdown Demo equipment	5:00

Attachment A: Summary of Rationale

The following is a summary of the selection committee's rationale for vendor susceptibility recommendations. This information is not intended to be all inclusive, but rather highlights some major points of discussion. In addition, the points below are not listed in order of priority.

Proposed Susceptible Vendors

LanData

- According to the vendor's RFP response, the system is in alignment with County's stated functional and technical requirements – representing a 93% fit. Following the vendor's full day software demonstration, the selection committee concurred that this is a true representation of the fit and that the system meets or exceeds this level. (Refer to Attachment D for the vendor demonstration script that all vendors were required to follow)
- System offers significant functionality above and beyond RFP requirements
- Lowest cost hardware, software and implementation services proposal (see Attachment B)
- Robust data extraction capabilities
- User-friendly, streamlined system with few exceptions
- Potential quick transition time and experience with aggressive implementations
- Proven ability to implement system in satellite offices, exceeding expectations and creating positive opportunities for Dallas County to pursue a similar arrangement
- Demonstrated commitment to the title industry and business model is in alignment with the County Clerk's goals
- Actively marketing adoption of eRecording to title companies
- Noteworthy references
- No major negative concerns

Result: Unanimous vote that LanData be rendered *susceptible* to continue in RFP process.

AmCad

- According to the vendor's RFP response, the system is in alignment with County's stated functional and technical requirements – representing a 94% fit. Following the vendor's full day software demonstration, the selection committee concurred that this is a true representation of the fit and that the system exceeds this level.
- User-friendly, streamlined system
- System offers significant functionality above and beyond RFP requirements
- "Can do" attitude with assurances that any modifications will be completed at no additional cost to the County
- The system is currently implemented in several large counties with transaction volumes exceeding 6,000 documents per day (note: in comparison, Dallas County's volumes exceed 2,500 documents per day).
- Detailed audit trail capabilities
- Higher eRecording volumes than other vendors representing proven experience in this area
- Low cost hardware, software and implementation services proposal (see Attachment B)
- Level of experience within the company
- Successful track record with large counties in multiple states
- No major negative concerns

Result: Unanimous vote that AmCad be rendered *susceptible* to continue in RFP process.

Note: Observations and analysis presented in this document are based on information provided to the County through the vendors' RFP responses and software demonstrations.